



JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.
Governor

GARY R. HERBERT
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
Division of Oil, Gas & Mining

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

Outgoing
C0150015
#3552
OK

July 13, 2010

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT
7003 2260 0002 0247 7846

John A. Gefferth, Environmental Engineer
Consolidation Coal Company
P.O. Box 566
Sesser, Illinois 62884

Subject: Proposed Assessment for Notice of Violation #10057, Consolidation Coal Company,
Emery Deep Mine, C/015/0015, Outgoing File

Dear Mr. Gefferth:

The undersigned has been appointed by the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining as the Assessment Officer for assessing penalties under R645-401.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced violation. The violation was issued by Division Inspector, Karl Houskeeper, on June 15, 2010. Rule R645-401-600 et. seq. has been utilized to formulate the proposed penalty. By these rules, any written information which was submitted by you or your agent within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this Notice of Violation has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of penalty.


Under R645-401-700, there are two informal appeal options available to you:

1. If you wish to informally appeal the fact of this violation, you should file a written request for an Informal Conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. This conference will be conducted by the Division Director, Associate Director or assigned conference officer. This Informal Conference is distinct from the Assessment Conference regarding the proposed penalty.
2. If you wish to review the proposed penalty assessment, you should file a written request for an Assessment Conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. If you are also requesting a review of the fact of violation, as noted in paragraph 1, the Assessment Conference will be scheduled immediately following that review.

Page 2
John Gefferth
July 13, 2010

If a timely request for review is not made, the fact of violation will stand, the proposed penalty(ies) will become final, and the penalty(ies) will be due and payable within thirty (30) days of the proposed assessment. Please remit payment to the Division, mail c/o Suzanne Steab.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joe Helfrich", written in a cursive style.

Joe Helfrich
Assessment Officer

JCH/sqs
Enclosure

cc: OSM Compliance Report
Suzanne Steab, DOGM
Price Field Office

O:\015015.EME\FINAL\PROASSESSMENT_N10057.DOCM

7003 2260 0002 0247 7846

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| U.S. Postal Service™ | |
| CERTIFIED MAIL™ RECEIPT | |
| <i>(Domestic Mail Only; No Insurance Coverage Provided)</i> | |
| For delivery information visit our website at www.usps.com ® | |
| OFFICIAL USE | |
| Postage | \$ |
| Certified Fee | |
| Return Receipt Fee (Endorsement Required) | |
| Restricted Delivery Fee (Endorsement Required) | |
| Total Po | John Gefferth |
| Sent To | Consolidation Coal Company |
| Street, Apt or PO Box | P.O. Box 566 |
| City, State | Sesser, IL 62884 |
| PS Form 3800, June 2002 | |
| See Reverse for Instructions | |

Postmark
Here

**WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING**

COMPANY / MINE Consolidation Coal Company
PERMIT C/015/0015 NOV / CO # 10057
ASSESSMENT DATE July 13, 2010

ASSESSMENT OFFICER Joe Helfrich

I. HISTORY (Max. 25 pts.)

- A. Are there previous violations, which are not pending or vacated, which fall one (1) year of today's date?

| PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS | EFFECTIVE DATE | POINTS |
|---------------------|----------------|---------|
| <u>None</u> | <u></u> | <u></u> |
| <u></u> | <u></u> | <u></u> |

1 point for each past violation, up to one (1) year
5 points for each past violation in a CO, up to one (1) year
No pending notices shall be counted

TOTAL HISTORY POINTS 0

II. SERIOUSNESS (Either A or B)

NOTE: For assignment of points in Parts II and III, the following apply:

1. Based on facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within each category where the violation falls.
2. Beginning at the mid-point of the category, the Assessment Officer will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector's and operator's statements as guiding documents.

Is this an EVENT (A) or HINDRANCE (B) violation? Event

A. EVENT VIOLATION (Max 45 pts.)

1. What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent?
Water Pollution
2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent?

None

| <u>PROBABILITY</u> | <u>RANGE</u> |
|--------------------|--------------|
| None | 0 |
| Unlikely | 1-9 |
| Likely | 10-19 |
| Occurred | 20 |

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage? RANGE 0-25
According to the inspector statement no damage occurred as a result of the violation.
 In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

*** *As previously noted no damage occurred as a result of the violation.*

B. HINDRANCE VIOLATION (Max 25 pts.)

1. Is this a POTENTIAL or ACTUAL hindrance to enforcement? _____
 RANGE 0-25

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS _____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 0

III. NEGLIGENCE (Max 30 pts.)

- A. Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care? IF SO--NO NEGLIGENCE; or, was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care, or the failure to abate any violation due to the same? IF SO--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE.

| | |
|-------------------------|-------|
| No Negligence | 0 |
| Negligence | 1-15 |
| Greater Degree of Fault | 16-30 |

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Negligence

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 8

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

***** According to the inspector statement this violation was the result of the lack of reasonable care. This shows ordinary negligence, which equates to the middle of the range.**

IV. GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.)

(Either A or B)

(Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures)

- A. Did the operator have onsite, the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area?

IF SO--EASY ABATEMENT

Easy Abatement Situation

- | | | |
|---|---|-------------|
| X | Immediate Compliance | -11 to -20* |
| | (Immediately following the issuance of the NOV) | |
| X | Rapid Compliance | -1 to -10 |
| | (Permittee used diligence to abate the violation) | |
| X | Normal Compliance | 0 |
| | (Operator complied within the abatement period required) | |
| | (Operator complied with condition and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan) | |

*Assign in upper of lower half of range depending on abatement occurring the 1st or 2nd half of abatement period.

- B. Did the permittee not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance, or does the situation require the submission of plans prior to physical activity to achieve compliance?

IF SO--DIFFICULT ABATEMENT

Difficult Abatement Situation

- | | | |
|---|---|-------------|
| X | Rapid Compliance | -11 to -20* |
| | (Permittee used diligence to abate the violation) | |
| X | Normal Compliance | -1 to -10* |
| | (Operator complied within the abatement period required) | |
| X | Extended Compliance | 0 |
| | (Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay within the limits of the NOV or the violated standard of the plan submitted for abatement was incomplete) | |

(Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? _____

ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 8

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

******* *According to the inspector statement Rapid compliance occurred. The abatement date was set for July 15, 2010. Notified by Ian McClain Consol on June 15, 2010 by phone that the silt fence had been replaced and/or repaired. Priscilla Burton confirmed that the citation had been abated on June 17, 2010. Citation was issued on June 14, 2010.*

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| NOTICE OF VIOLATION # <u>N 10057</u> | |
| I. | TOTAL HISTORY POINTS <u>0</u> |
| II. | TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS <u>0</u> |
| III. | TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS <u>8</u> |
| IV. | TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS <u>-8</u> |
| | TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS <u>0</u> |
| TOTAL ASSESSED FINE <u>\$ 0</u> | |